1	CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS	
2	Ray Ballister, Jr., Esq., SBN 111282 Mark Potter, Esq., SBN 166317	
3	Mark Potter, Esq., SBN 166317 Phyl Grace, Esq., SBN 171771 Dennis Price, SBN 279082	
	Mail: PO Box 262490	
4	San Diego, CA 92196-2490 Delivery: 9845 Erma Road, Suite 300	
5	San Diego, CA 92131 (858) 375-7385; (888) 422-5191 fax	
6	phylg@potterhandy.com	
7	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
8		
9		NOTE OF THE
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11	50011221012101	
12	Chris Langer,	Case No. '14CV2473 JAH BGS
13	Plaintiff,	Complaint For Damages And Injunctive Relief For Violations
14	V.	Of: American's With Disabilities
15	Paul A. Swerdlove, in his individual	Act; Unruh Civil Rights Act; California Disabled Persons Act;
16	and representative capacity as trustee of the Swerdlove Paul A. Trust (12-	Negligence
17	15-94);	
18	Yogurt Baby, Inc., a California Corporation; and Does 1-10,	
19	Defendants.	
20		
21	Plaintiff Chris Langer complains of Defendants Paul A. Swerdlove, in	
22	his individual and representative capacity as trustee of the Swerdlove Paul	
23	A. Trust (12-15-94); Yogurt Baby, Inc., a California Corporation; and Does	
24	1-10 ("Defendants") and alleges as follo	ows:
25		
	PARTIES:	
26	1. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities. He is a	
27	paraplegic who cannot walk and who u	ses a wheelchair for mobility. He has
28	_	•

2 3

4

5 6

7

8 9 10

11

17 18

19 20

21

22

24 25

23

26 27

28

a specially equipped van with a ramp that deploys out of the passenger side of his van and he has a Disabled Person Parking Placard issued to him by the State of California.

- 2. Defendants are, or were at the time of the incidents, the real property owners, business operators, lessors and/or lessees for the Yogurt Escape shop ("Shop") located at or about 942 Orange Avenue, Coronado, California.
- 3. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of, and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants herein, including Does 1 through 10, inclusive, is responsible in some capacity for the events herein alleged, or is a necessary party for obtaining appropriate relief. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of the Defendants and Does 1 through 10, inclusive, are ascertained.

JURISDICTION & VENUE:

- 4. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.
- 5. Pursuant to pendant jurisdiction, an attendant and related cause of action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of the same transactions, is also brought under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act, and the California Disabled Persons Act, which acts expressly incorporate the Americans with Disabilities Act.
- 6. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and is founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action

is located in this district and that Plaintiff's cause of action arose in this district.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:

- 7. The Plaintiff went to the Shop in April of 2014 to eat.
- 8. The Shop is a facility open to the public, a place of public accommodation, and a business establishment.
- 9. Parking spaces are one of the facilities, privileges and advantages offered by defendants to their customers at the Shop.
- 10. Unfortunately, although parking spaces are one of the facilities available to patrons of the Shop, there is not a single compliant handicap parking space available for disabled persons.
- 11. Plaintiff alleges that a fully compliant accessible parking space once existed at this location but the parking space has been allowed to fade away to the point that it is no longer available for use by disabled persons. Because of defendants' lack of maintenance and care, the accessible parking space is no longer available for use by disabled persons.
- 12. Defendants have no policy or procedure in place to make sure that the accessible parking spaces remain useable in the parking lot. As such, the parking space reserved for disabled persons is no longer available for disabled customers.
- 13. The plaintiff personally encountered this problem. This inaccessible condition denied the plaintiff full and equal access and caused him difficulty and frustration.
- 14. Plaintiff would like to return and patronize the Shop but will be deterred from visiting until the defendants cure the violation. Plaintiff lives in San Diego County and shops at various places around the county. Businesses in San Diego are conveniently located for plaintiff. Because of

2

3

4 5

6 7

8 9

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

26

25

27 28 the location of the Shop, plaintiff would like to return to the Shop in the future.

15. The defendants have failed to maintain in working and useable conditions those features required to provide ready access to persons with disabilities.

16. Given the obvious and blatant violations, the plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that there are other violations and barriers on the site that relate to his disability. Plaintiff will amend the complaint, to provide proper notice regarding the scope of this lawsuit, once he conducts a site inspection. However, please be on notice that the plaintiff seeks to have all barriers related to his disability remedied. See *Doran v.* 7-11, 506 F.3d 1191 (9th Cir. 2007) (holding that once a plaintiff encounters one barrier at a site, he can sue to have all barriers that relate to his disability removed regardless of whether he personally encountered them).

17. Additionally, on information and belief, the plaintiff alleges that the failure to remove these barriers was intentional because: (1) these particular barriers are intuitive and obvious; (2) the defendants exercised control and dominion over the conditions at this location and, therefore, the lack of accessible facilities was not an "accident" because had the defendants intended any other configuration, they had the means and ability to make the change.

I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990 (On behalf of plaintiffs and against all defendants (42 U.S.C. section 12101, et seq.)

18. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.

- 19. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to ensure that the privileges, advantages, accommodations, facilities, goods and services of any place of public accommodation is offered on a full and equal basis by anyone who owns, leases, or operates a place of public accommodation. See 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a). Discrimination is defined, inter alia, as follows:
 - a. A failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the accommodation would work a fundamental alteration of those services and facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).
 - b. A failure to remove architectural barriers where such removal is readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). Barriers are defined by reference to the ADAAG, found at 28 C.F.R., Part 36, Appendix "D."
 - c. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and the bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the altered area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).
- 20. Any business that provides parking spaces must provide handicap parking spaces. 1991 Standards § 4.1.2(5); 2010 Standards § 208. One in every eight of those handicap parking spaces but not less than one must be a "van" accessible parking space, *i.e.*, having an eight foot access aisle. 1991 Standards § 4.1.2(5)(b). Under the 2010 Standards, one in every six

again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.

- 28. Because the defendants violated the plaintiff's rights under the ADA, they also violated the Disabled Persons Act and are liable for damages. (Civ. Code § 54.1(d), 54.3(a).)
- 29. Because the violation of the Disabled Persons Act resulted in difficulty, discomfort or embarrassment for the plaintiffs, the defendants are also each responsible for statutory damages, i.e., a civil penalty. (Civ. Code § 55.56(a)-(c).)

IV. FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION: NEGLIGENCE (On behalf of plaintiff and against all defendants)

- 30. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.
- 31. The Defendants had a general duty and a duty arising under the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act and California Disabled Persons Act to provide safe, convenient, and accessible facilities to the plaintiffs. Their breach of this duty, as alleged in the preceding paragraphs, has caused injury and damage as alleged above.

PRAYER:

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this court award damages and provide relief as follows:

1. For injunctive relief, compelling defendants to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Note: the Plaintiffs are not invoking section 55 of the California Civil Code and is not seeking injunctive relief under the Disabled Persons Act at all.

- 2. Damages under the Unruh Civil Rights Act and/or the California Disabled Persons Act which damages provide for actual damages and a statutory minimum of \$4,000. Note: a plaintiff cannot recover under both acts, simultaneously, and an election will be made prior to or at trial.
- 3. Reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; Cal. Civ. Code §§ 52 and 54.3.

Dated: September 29, 2014 CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS

By:

Mark Potter, Esq. Attorneys for Plaintiff